DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 948 SO 014 956

AUTHOR Schubert, Jane G.
TITLE An Interactive Approach to Infusing Equity: A Teacher Model.
INSTITUTION American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 1983). For a related document, see SO 014 957.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Federal Programs; *Females; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; School Districts; *Sex Fairness; Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS Womens Educational Equity Act

ABSTRACT

Results of five demonstration programs funded by the Women's Educational Equity Act in school districts throughout the United States are described. Demonstration sites were the Reidsville (North Carolina) City School System, Quincy (Massachusetts) Public Schools, Lincoln County (Oregon) School System, Tucson (Arizona) Unified School District, and Broward County (Florida) School District. The programs emphasized a teacher-focused approach to change. They employed an interactive approach to the design and implementation of the project, worked toward integration of sex equity into the existing educational programs, and fostered self-reliance designed to sustain sex equity when federal support ended. Evaluation of the programs consisted of standardized measures, classroom observations, teacher interviews and surveys, case studies, and evaluations of training sessions by participants. Changes occurred on three levels. One, teachers directly incorporated an activity into a lesson previously written. For example, they conducted a discussion of words that link gender to occupation and identified how traditional division of labor for household chores might be changed. Two, teachers expanded an idea or developed a spinoff activity, such as adding a discussion of women not included in a history text. Three, original plans based on non-textbook sources were used. Most teachers believed that as a result of the project they had acquired a new, heightened, and more informed awareness of the pervasiveness of gender stereotyping, bias, and discrimination. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane G. Schubert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED233948

SP014952

An Interactive Approach to Infusing Equity: A Teacher Model

American Educational Research Association
April 1983

Jane G. Schubert

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
P.O. Box 1113, 1791 Arastradero Rd., Palo Alto, Ca. 94302 ● 415/493-3550

Public school teachers receive a lot of bad press. Some of the criticism is probably valid. We are dismayed to learn that many teachers in California are unable to successfuly complete skill-based performance measures. Such conditions can and should be corrected. But much of the "good press" which teachers deserve is seldom heard beyond the schools or homes of those directly involved in the educational system.

This paper features that positive side. It describes the approach, activities, and accomplishments of classroom teachers in five local school districts who have implemented equitable resources and practices in their classes. This action stems from their participation in a nationwide effort to demonstrate educational equity in five local education agencies. Five contractors, each collaborating with one of these districts, received a mandate that ranged from the selection and utilization of equity materials in K-12 schools to programmatic activities that tapped the business and community resources outside the formal educational system. The component of these demonstration projects addressed in this paper is the role of the faculty in the demonstration process and the extent to which the success of the implementation effort and the prospects for continuation can be attributed to these educators.

This paper is organized as follows: an introduction to the five demonstration projects; a rationale for directing the bulk of the staff development activities on the classroom teacher; a set of maxims that guided our relationship with the teachers; the effects of project participation on the teachers; and the indicators that suggest institutionalization of equitable concepts and practices in participating schools.

A. The Five Demonstration Projects

Five projects, whose purpose is to demonstrate the use of educational equity practices and resources, operate in five local education agencies throughout the United States. They are funded under the Women's Educational Equity Act.* It was authorized in 1974 as part of the Special Projects Act of the Education Amendments of 1974, PL 93-380 and reauthorized in the 1978 (Title IX, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) Education Amendments. The Act states that:

> Sec. 931(b)(1) The Congress finds and declares that educational programs in the United States, as presently conducted, are frequently inequitable as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society.
>
> Sec. 931(b)(2) It is the purpose of this part to provide educational equity for women in the United States and to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

*The projects received awards in 1979 to conduct needs assessments that resulted in the design of a three-year implementation phase (1980-1983). All projects are now completing the third and final implementation year.

The demonstration projects represent a logical step in the development plan of the Women's Educational Equity Act Program. From 1976 through 1979, the WEEA Program awarded grants and contracts for the development of resources useful for educational personnel in local education agencies. Although the development activities continued, WEEA expanded its program by supporting the establishment of school-based demonstration projects. These projects showcase the implementation of available resources and strategies designed to promote educational equity. In addition, school districts participating in the demonstrations host visitors from inside and outside the demonstration site to observe the implementation activities. Non-project participants learn about the process through an intern training program aimed at establishing similar practices in other school districts.

Five institutions received contracts in 1980 to implement a comprehensive program of educational equity in a local education agency. Each demonstration project is designed to:

- o use materials that contribute to an educational environment free of sex and ethnic bias;
- o assist educators at all levels to integrate equity concepts in their instructional practices;
- o provide a setting where people can observe equitable practices;
- o offer training to individuals interested in establishing equity programs in their own schools; and
- o collect qualitative and quantitative data as bases for judging the extent to which the program achieves its aims.

The five contractors and the sites of the demonstration projects are:

Contracting Agency	Demonstration Site
	PROJECT NEED
The University of Tennessee Bureau of Educational Research & Services 212 Claxton Education Building Knoxville, TN 37916	Reidsville City School System 920 Johnson Street Reidsville, NC 27320
Dr. Donna Young Project Director	Ms. Marilyn Pergerson Change Facilitator
	PROJECT INTERACTION
The NETWORK, Inc. 290 South Main Street Andover, MA 01810	Quincy Public Schools 70 Coddington Street Quincy, MA 02169

Ms. Leslie Kergert Project Director	Ms. Alicia Coletti Site Coordinator
	PROJECT EQUITY
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory 300 S.W. 6th Avenue Portland, OR 97204	Lincoln County School System P. O. Box 1110 Newport, OR 97365
Ms. Barbara Hutchison Project Director	Ms. Joy Wallace Field Coordinator
	PROJECT FOCUS
American Institutes for Research P. O. Box 1113 Palo Alto, CA 94302	Tucson Unified School District 1010 10th Street Tucson, AZ 85710
Dr. Jane Schubert Project Director	Ms. Marilyn Pearce, Primary School Site Coordinator Ms. Carol Thomas, Secondary School Site Coordinator Career Guidance Project
	THE NATIONAL SEX EQUITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
The University of Miami School of Education & Allied Professions P. O. Box 248065 Coral Gables, FL 33124	Broward County School District 3600 S.W. College Avenue Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33313
Ms. Kathleen Shea Project Director	Ms. Joan Hinden Project Coordinator

While the objectives are common to all the demonstration projects, the contractors and the local education agencies designed activities tailored to each site. We now introduce each of the five demonstrations of educational equity. These profiles establish the framework within which each project operates and describe the general implementation approach that governs project activities.

The five sites represent diversity in size, geographic area, ethnicity, and growth rate. Some of this diversity is captured in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Some Characteristics of the Five Sites

	Site				
	Reidsville	Lincoln County	Quincy	Tucson	Broward County
Population	17,500	34,000	90,000	500,000	900,000
School Enrollment	4,700	5,000	10,900	57,000	134,000
Number of Schools	8	20	20	100	167
Project Schools	4	5	7	15	13
Ethnicity	44% Black	95% White	White	28% Mexican American	23% Black
Population Growth	Stable	Stable	Declining	Rapid Growth	Rapid Growth

There are also differences in population density. Lincoln County is largely rural--the largest town having a population of about 7,500; Reidsville is a small town in a predominantly rural area; Quincy is an old, small city in the Boston SMSA; Tucson and Broward County provide examples of the "new" and rapidly growing sunbelt cities.

The project design reflects close collaboration between the contracting agency and the demonstration school district, a policy maintained through on-site project personnel.

In the following paragraphs, we describe each site's approach toward implementing educational equity and the emergence or creation of a "core" group, a smaller cluster of teachers among the participants whose involvement is visibly more intense than others.

In the smallest district, Reidsville, faculty from all schools have participated in one or more NEED events. Of the eight district schools, the four with the highest concentration of core and participating faculty serve as model project schools. Schools were asked to join the project following the system-wide needs assessment which applied an index of equity interest among the schools. Core teachers agreed to: use WEEA and other equity materials; permit visitors to observe their classrooms; allow a class to be videotaped for the evaluation component and/or for dem- onstration purposes; and participate in a minimum of two quarters of equity staff development. Participating, non-core teachers agreed to use equity materials and participate in a minimum of one quarter of equity staff development. During the second year, each district school was represented on a 10 member advisory panel which contributed to project planning and coordination.

In Lincoln County, five of the 20 county schools serve as demonstration schools. They were selected on the basis of their strong, favorable attitudes toward equity as determined by the needs assessment and building administrator support. Steering Committees, composed of approximately 6 members from each school set the equity goals for the year and design building activities to meet those goals. Committee members constitute the "core faculty." Model demonstration schools receive equity resource materials and inservice training. Individual teachers choose the extent to which they participate in the equity program at each of the five demonstration schools. Teachers from non-site schools receive the opportunity to participate in project activities such as training workshops; they may also observe demonstration lessons presented by the project staff.

Project Inter-Action in Quincy primarily serves seven Impact Schools. Each Impact School formed an action team composed of administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, and sometimes students to plan equity activities for the school year. These action teams (4-6 members) met four to eight times per year and implemented an equity theme of their choice. Typically, a school-wide event based on the theme was held. Action teams enlisted the support of both teachers and students to use equity resources and to participate in these events. The project provided these resources; two methods stimulated teacher interest in their use. One was to exhibit the materials so that interested colleagues could meet with faculty users to discuss strategies appropriate for grade level and subject. The second was a resource packet containing excerpts from equity materials, keyed to the school-wide events, that was distributed to faculty for classroom use. District-wide workshops and training sessions offered opportunities for more educators and students to learn about equity; some of these were conducted jointly with other WEEA-funded projects. "Core" implementors in Quincy are those educators who utilize the resources they receive and infuse equitable instructional practices into their classes.

In Tucson, 15 FOCUS schools receive direct service delivery from the project staff, although some project events are open to all educators in the district. "Core faculty" receive more staff development, resources, and technical assistance plus conduct inservice and outreach activities for TUSD and University of Arizona educators. During the second year, each FOCUS faculty member agreed in writing to: attend all building meetings and workshops designed specifically for them; design and implement special projects aimed at infusing equity in their classrooms, schools, or the district; assist in training out-of-district interns and advise new FOCUS faculty and others upon request. In return, these teachers received a modest stipend for their participation. The project placed a permanent collection of teacher-selected equity resources in 25 FOCUS schools (years one and two). Building faculty designated a FOCUS manager who served as a liaison between FOCUS faculty in the school and a Sex Equity Specialist, who provided ongoing technical assistance.

The Broward County School System is the tenth largest in the nation. The core of the demonstration is the NOVA Research and Development Center where participants from its four schools were recruited through district-wide meetings, presentations, and workshops. Each school hosts a Sex Equity Committee. During the second implementation year, nine "ring schools" from Broward County joined the demonstration. Teachers who participated in the project reviewed materials and conducted demonstration lessons. Workshops

on a variety of sex equity issues were offered to to the educators in participating schools.

B. A Teacher-focused Approach to Change

During a school day, students meet and interact with an assortment of individuals. Our recognition of the potential influence of so many people is reflected in the inservice workshops open to educators at all levels (and often the parents) that ranged from district administrators to non-certified personnel. Our training priorities, however, addressed the requirements for infusing equity at the classroom level. Our rationale was that the teachers' behavior is the most critical in determining what happens in a classroom; if removing and reducing barriers to equitable educational opportuinities is to become a reality, then the classroom teacher is a key instrument of change. Equal treatment of all students regardless of characteristics such as gender or ethnicity should be the natural practice for those who influence the intellectual and emotional growth of our youth.

The quality of learning depends on the quality of teaching. This is the responsibility of the classroom teacher. He or she creates the ambiance/environment of the classroom, decides how resources and media will be used, selects participants in class discussions, organizes students to work in small groups, etc. One of the important elements of quality teaching is fairness; if students are treated differently because of their sex, ethnic origin, or race (or any reason), then their opportunities for learning are reduced. Most teachers do not intentionally discriminate against students, but they often do. Teachers communicate messages in subtle but important ways: students won't learn from someone who doesn't like them or expect them to learn. Mortimer Adler states, in the Paideia Proposal (p. 43), that "all children...have a right to whatever conditions are needed for the pursuit of happiness--needed for their making the most of themselves and for their living as well as possible."

A summary of the research on sex bias in classroom interaction was prepared by the Mid-Atlantic Center for Sex Equity. Illustrations of teacher behavior are divided into four patterns: sex segregation; classroom discipline; active teaching attention; and verbal evaluation. A few examples appear below:

- Teacher-time devoted in step-by-step instruction is greater for males than for females; teachers are more likely to perform tasks for girls, thus reinforcing their dependency.

- High achieving females tend to receive less praise and attention than either high or low achieving males, although low achieving males received less praise or attention than high achieving males.

- Segregation by sex for classroom assignments is often initiated by teachers, and if not, students may separate themselves by sex--thus creating the notion of opposites or "being against" the other sex.

- Males tend to be disciplined more frequently than females. Although they may misbehave more often, whether or not

teachers expect this or the boys strive for attention is speculation, but a consequence is that one sex receives more than its hare of scoldings. This could foster antagonistic relationships between the sexes.

- Among fourth and fifth graders, males' praise of their academic work was related to intellectual quality while the females were praised for the neatness and form of their papers. When females did receive criticism for their academic work, the comments were directed toward intellectual inadequacy.

- Feedback patterns given to males and females suggest that females exhibit learned helplessness--and likely to blame themselves for not being able to perform the tasks rather than to believe there may be other explanations, such as lack of effort.

The above list merely taps the reservoir of documented behaviors that limit the learning opportunities of some members of the school population. The next section describes our approach to working with teachers in order to create awareness of such practices, assist them in examining their own behaviors, and finally to change those deemed unfair to students.

C. Maxims that Guided Teacher Participation

The principles stated below reflect conceptual notions underlying the demonstrations and the combined experience of all five projects. This is an initial attempt to summarize them, but by no means, exhaustive. Scant research on the role of staff development as a systematic body of knowledge exists. However, the literature on school effectiveness lends insight into staff development activities and the role of the teacher with respect to successful and unsuccessful innovations. Findings such as working with schools whose principals are strong leaders and supportive of an innovative concept (Edmonds 1979 and Cohen 1980), and selecting teachers who become active participants in the planning and implementation process (Devaney & Thorn 1975 and Little 1981), are consistent with our approach.

The following paragraphs state the maxims that guided our collaboration with classroom teachers, followed by a brief profile of the strategies we used to implement these maxims.

1. We employed an interactive approach to the design and implementation of the demonstration of educational equity.

Findings from numerous research investigations document the importance the relationship between those who bring a new idea to an educational system and those who are ultimately responsible for accepting or rejecting it. One of the most comprehensive conclusions of the Rand study was that the predictors of effective implementation are likely to lie in those project characteristics that promote or inhibit the adaptation to the institutional setting. The process of implementation is perhaps more important than the educational treatment or technology in determining adaptation (Berman, et al., 1975). Many researchers attest to the importance of including proposed actors in the planning process; absence of such individuals often explains

implementation failures (Berman 1975 and Elmore 1978). Lack of input from practitioners can result in lack of utilization of output because there is little assurance that output will relate to local needs. (Darkenwald, Beder, and Adelman 1974).

Each demonstration site utilized district educators in ways deemed appropriate to the local needs. These decisions stemmed from a site-specific needs assessment conducted during a design phase. All sites received administrative support from the top, but with two exceptions, the higher-level administrators were not directly involved in specific project planning. We all worked with schools who had strong administrative leaders. A principal's participation is often cited as critical for school-based programs (Kagan 1978), (Berman 1975). Successful implementation requires strong local leaders, preferably with admnistrative and instructional expertise (Treadway 1981). Our principals chose their level of involvement--some observed planning sessions and offered input, particularly with regard to realistic constraints of the district administrative structure; some worked with other staff in actual planning and design. One site invited the administrative and classroom planners to a weekend retreat.

We view the most important collaborators with project staff as the classroom teachers. We had a higher representation from this group than from other educators in a district. Teachers sat on action teams, steering committees, and advisory panels which met regularly with project staff to decide how best to infuse equity in their schools. During the third and final implementation year, teachers contributed to the strategies for successful continuation when the external financial resources will be exhausted.

Having met the requirement for local substantive participation, it was equally important to match interpersonal styles so that implementation of equity was the highest priority and received the most attention. We believed this quality contributed as much to the effectiveness of the program as the knowledge and expertise represented by the participants. Berman et al (1978) found that "a critical mass of project staff in a given site was essential to implementation." The individuals who participated were often perceived as leaders in a school or district; some sites rotated these among such individuals in order to permit greater participation.

As part of this interactive structure, we built-in channels of communication among the planning groups when not in formal session. Project staff were available to provide advice and technical assistance when needed. Personal intervention and contact was necessary to generate and sustain interest in the projects.

2. We aimed toward integration of equity into the existing educational program.

To consider educational equity as another topic to be introduced into the curriculum rather than to become an integral part of the standard operating procedure of an educational system misses the point. Several factors must be considered when striving for infusion of an existing program: a) the congruence between the project's ideals and the existing instructional program; b) changes necessary to incorporate project resources and practices; c) and the extent to which teachers are willing to invest in

bringing about such changes. Although supportive educators believed in the value of educational equity, we learned that the basis for deciding whether or not to adopt the concepts and practices of equity depended on other factors. Berman et al. (1975) found that integration into ongoing procedures were important characteristics of successful innovations at both the school and the classroom level and that narrow treatments did not lead to broad-based or enduring change in teacher behavior as much as comprehensive changes might. Kerins and Associates (1971) learned that teachers tended to adopt innovations that were within the overall structure of their world; the opportunity to develop or adapt materials deemed most appropriate for the local schools and classrooms was important to the acceptance of the new ideas (Berman 1975). Perhaps the value is in the activity of tailor-producing one's own materials as much as the final product.

Our training sessions and staff development activities attempted to incorporate these parameters. Introductory activities stressed a non-threatening approach to educational equity that encouraged participants to choose elements most suitable for their teaching style. We talked about what equity meant and why it was important. During the period of the implementation process (over three years) we encouraged teachers to try a particular resource or an instructional practice with which he or she felt comfortable. Some might select an activity which had been used at a workshop, or a lesson demonstrated by a staff member in a school; others would try new ways of grouping children for class activities; others were interested in observing their own language patterns. We gave people time to try things out and time to talk to their colleagues about their experiences at school meetings and training sessions. We allowed time for trial and error. The formal training sessions progressed from awareness and orientation to skill-building and providing opportunities for the highly involved teachers to begin to inservice their colleagues.

The specific training optics differed across the five sites. Some common topics included: identifying bias in textbooks and other resources; addressing ways in which equitable materials and practices could be incorporated into specific subjects such as math and science; designing and distributing packets on activities for women's history week; developing strategies for addressing cutural equity along with sex equity; reviewing, selecting and adapting resources for specific schools and classrooms.

We acknowledged the differences in the elementary classroom environment and the secondary classroom environment. One of the most obvious, of course, is the difference in the time teachers spend with students. An elementary project teacher who spends all day with a group of young people exposes them to materials, applies equitable teaching strategies, and organizes them in mixed sex/culture interest groups on an ongoing and continuing basis. It's part of the daily life in that classroom. Secondary students who may only be exposed to one project teacher during a day will not receive the same reinforcement.

3. We fostered self-reliance to develop a local capability designed to sustain equity when federal support ends.

Demonstration programs funded with federal dollars have a limited existence. Most of these programs that promoted new concepts and ideals do not want to see the notions die when the "demonstration" ends. We prepared for

our withdrawal throughout the implementation process by developing local teacher capability to be independent of our assistance. Haber (1963) found that the impetus for adopting new practices comes from the teaching staff; others (Cobb 1974 and Hampson 1971) confirm the notion that the stimulus comes from within the teaching staff.

Our training sessions included activities that required participation by the teacher/trainees. For example, project staffs purchased and collected a myriad of equitable resources, but the final review and selection of appropriateness for a particular subject or classroom was made by the teacher. Many of the resources did not contain specific lessons or "how to" suggestions, so we set aside plenty of time for teachers to plan some activities and then to try them out. Teachers received information about the source of the materials and media and each participating school received its own inventory of teacher-selected materials. Another strategy applied when we talked about negative interactive classroom practices, was to illustrate by example, then ask teachers to discuss occurrences in their own classes. We encouraged teachers to join their own networks in and out of their own school or district in an effort to encourage and provide opportunities for meeting and sharing ideas with colleagues.

In a study that examined the behaviors of school staff, it was found that teachers talking to teachers about professional activities was a characteristic of school success (Little 1981). Our workshops included opportunities for teacher exchange, especially in the larger districts where teachers from one part of the district did not know teachers from another location, even if they taught the same subject of grade.

Not all teacher participants received the same number of training hours within or across sites. However, in each site resides a group of "more highly involved" teachers--the role these teachers play in the third year and the anticipated role following the end of the demonstrations varies also by site. In one site, for example, these highly involved teachers received a minimum 50 hours training; they now prepare materials and conduct inservice workshops for their district colleagues. Some of them also participate in small-group training sessions for student teachers at the local university. But they each have a "special project" designed to make them visible in their district and responsible for inservice education of their colleagues so they will be recognized as the local experts and practitioners in educational equity.

4. Be responsive to changes--within the system, among the participants, and in the project's original design.

Things seldom go as planned no matter how carefully one responded to existing contextual and institutional variables, selected and involved local participants in the implementation process, or thought through the fundamental concepts of the project. During the course of a multi-year project, changes will occur. For example, the organization of the school district can be altered; the key actors in both the project and the district may be different; the project ideas may not be utilized in the way the original designers envisioned. One of the conclusions of the Rand study is that mutual adaptation often characterizes an innovation (Berman 1975). This is especially true if modifications are made to suit local parameters. If you support an interactive implementation process, then you must be flexible

enough to allow participants to influence the process and often the product. Of course, one doesn't want to be so flexible as to lose sight of the original purpose.

D. Documented Differences in Teacher Behavior

What has happened as a consequence of our training and development activities with classroom teachers during the implementation years? Have any changes occurred, and if so, what are they?

The answer to the first question is a definite yes. The evaluation procedures at each site have evidence from a variety of data sources that document change--pre-post measures from standardized measures, classroom observations, teacher interviews and surveys, case studies of individual classrooms, and evaluations of training sessions by the participants. The remainder of this section describes some of these changes from both a professional and a personal perspective.

One change that has taken place in project classrooms (and in many non-project classrooms) is through the use of equitable resources. Three general levels of use are: (1) adopting lessons or activities "as is"; (2) expanding or developing an idea found in a resource; and (3) "going beyond" the resource by developing one's own ideas and/or by altering a traditional practice or procedure.

The first level, using an activity planned by someone else, is straightforward. It requires little adaptation; the teacher directly incorporates the activity into a lesson previously written. Teachers may use the material as an adjunct or a special event. Activities in this category include:

- nonsexist classroom organization (lineups, play groups);
- discussion of words that link gender to occupations (e.g. "policeman," "fireman," "housewife,") and presentation of alternative generic forms; and
- identifying responsibility for household chores and how the traditional division of labor might be altered.

The second way of using resources typically involves expanding an idea or developing a spinoff activity; this requires creativity and application of new knowledge and skills. Sometimes a change was required because of special classes such as adaptive education or gifted and talented. It is also common to find teachers of one grade level modifying an idea for use at another grade level.

- Youngsters who studied the middle ages also discussed Joan of Arc, even though she was not included in the text.
- A discussion in a primary class on whether or not objects could be labeled as girls' or boys' led into an activity using the color-wheel wherein students named their favorite color. The associations of certain colors were then explored.

The third level of implementation reveals and initiative by users; it most clearly indicates progress toward infusion. At this level, there is less dependency on others' suggestions and more development of original plans based on non-textbook resources. Movement and actions automatically begin to reflect an integration of equity concepts.

- Instituting about practices such as lining up students by sex alerts a teacher to other gender-based grouping patterns and the teacher begins to mix the sexes, e.g. during class chores, in play groups, or at lunch tables.

- Students in a media class are encouraged to identify sexist remarks by other students or the teacher. The remarks are then recorded and placed in a special box at the front of the class for the teacher to use in initiating discussions. This exercise provides a constant reminder of how pervasive sexism is.

- A teacher makes certain that sentences in a spelling test do not contain biased phrases or statements.

- Social studies faculty incorporate equity concepts into a state's K-5 competency requirements.

- Teachers review story books and design equity activities based on a situation or an episode in the story.

Classroom behaviors of teachers have changed in ways such as the following:

- faculty attend workshops that address equity issues and practices;

- teachers alter segregated practices such as grouping or seating assignments to integrate class activities;

- some faculty have taken steps to enlighten their colleagues about the importance of equity and how equitable practices may be implemented in their classes;

- faculty share their equity materials with their colleagues;

- faculty identify how obstacles to equity can be faced in their districts and have taken steps toward reducing those barriers;

- faculty encourage female students to assume leadership responsibilities, to consider preparing for jobs and careers in nontraditional occupations, and to enroll in science and math classes; and

- faculty adopt non-sexist language as well as assisting others to do the same.

When a distinction was made between elementary and secondary faculty, some differences emerged. One is in the approach toward infusing. Elementary teachers tend to integrate equitable practices by grouping students for an activity such as a spelling bee in ways other than "boys on one side and girls on the other." They may create "interest centers" for math or crafts. Most teachers who are aware about sex equity are also conscious of cultural bias; instructional changes tend to benefit cultural integration as well. The integration is less evident in secondary schools; teachers report some difficulty in implementing equitable ideas into the instructional program. In most cases, they can not discontinue using their current textbooks for WEEA texts. As a result, they are inclined to think about "lessons or courses in equity."

We have some sense of teachers' perceptions of overall impact in the schools and on themselves. In one site, the faculty believed that one of the most valuable project outcomes was heightening awareness of the pervasiveness and, consequently, the importance of equity, and then having the project provide tools for combatting harmful practices. Many faculty members believed that changes attributable to the project will be permanent because people now think and see educational practices differently than they used to. In another project, the project faculty displayed more knowledge about equity issues than their colleagues and believed that more should be done to educate those not directly involved. They were actively involved with project staff and have developed their own ideas for using equity resources, but also see opportunities all around them for communicating equity messages to their students. They also believe that it takes time for teaching practices to turn around and many of them demonstrate to others what they themselves have learned. This is critical if institution-building is to occur.

At one site, at the close of the second year, teacher reported either their most interesting equity experiences in situations not involving their own students, or their most interesting cross-age or cross-grade equity experiences. Responses to this item clearly demonstrate that the project had effects beyond the individual teacher's classroom.

The largest number of responses concerned experiences with colleagues. For example teachers shared equity information and suggestions broadly and informally with their colleagues; formally--e.g. in departmental or other meetings--shown equity films and stimulated discussions that led educators to an increased awareness of their responsibility to promote sex fairness; and worked with co-teachers on analyzing classroom materials for sex bias.

The second most frequently mentioned setting for interesting equity experiences and reflections was the community. Here, teachers cited a variety of interactions, e.g.: using equity materials in teaching a Sunday school class; accompanying friends to a local nightclub featuring male dancers; talking with women returning to college; interfacing with businesses. Teachers indicated that, as a result of their training, they derived new rea..izations from, and insights into, such events.

A third area of commentary centered on experiences with family members in general, and child-rearing in particular. For example, one male teacher reported that:

- FOCUS has made me more aware of sex equity, especially with regard to raising my two-year-old son. Once we are free of traditional sex roles we will be much happier, more interesting, and better all-around human beings.

Another wrote that, as a result of "bringing home" her training, she was "...fascinated to watch my husband, a very traditional male, suddenly realize that he wanted more for his daughter than washing clothes and dishes. Seeing him re-evaluate his values was very special."

In this same survey, teachers were asked what participation in the program had meant to them and what personal awareness and enrichment they had derived from it.

By far the most frequent responses dealt with teachers' observations that, as a direct result of the demonstration project, they had acquired a new, heightened, and/or more informed and sensitive awareness of the pervasiveness of stereotyping, bias, and discrimination on the basis of gender. In addition to general observations on bias in society, teachers mentioned their increaed awareness of bias towards males and prejudice in the mass media, textbooks, industry, socialization patterns, marriage vows, and even in themselves and in their professional and family lives.

A second major theme closely related to the first centered on teacher's newly acquired skills, resources, and concrete information--all of which they felt have led them to become significantly more knowledgeable and equitable as both teachers and individuals. Some quotes inlclude:

- I can't believe how unaware I was of the limiting expectations I had for myself, as a woman.
- The project has given me a chance to enlarge my scope and open myself to new opportunities. I see where I can grow as an individual.
- This program has made me realize the importance of people expressing their individuality in careers and personal interests.
- Being in the program has increased my sensitivity to human needs.

E. Prospects for Continuation of Equitable Concepts and Practices

Having demonstrated that it is possible to infuse equitable resources and practices into an existing instructional program, how long can we expect them to last when the external resources are no longer available to maintain the infusion? The demonstration concept does not permit an examination of effects after the projects conclude. That is left for others to explore. One criterion frequently mentioned for judging the success or failure of a demonstration project is whether or not local funds will be used to support the project activities. Given the current financial realities of local education agencies, it is highly unlikely that any of these projects will be a line item in the district budget. But we believe there is little need for

there to be; we believe that continuation is linked to facors other than financial.

We have attempted to incorporate equitable principles into existing administrative and programmatic structures. Teachers who received training during the project serve on advisory committees to select new instructional resources and to plan district-wide curriculum guides. Because these projects have worked closely with Title IX Coordinators in the districts, many of them are more involved program roles within the districts; equitable policies adapted at the district level have new meaning because a known cadre of teachers throughout the system can respond to inservice and training needs.

At the classroom level, participating teachers (especially the high involvers) have developed a sense of ownership - they recognize their role in the success of the implementation and their responsibility to continue to influence their colleagues. We have provided visibility for them to become known in their community. By so doing, their role/function as teachers has expanded to one of peer trainer. Most importantly, having learned and become convinced of the value of equity, it has become part of how they teach.

References

Adler, M. The paideia proposal. New York: MacMillan Co., 1982.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. IV: The findings in review. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Cobb, J. C. The social network of influence in the adoption of an innovation: community education at Webb City, 1965-1972. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon-Eugene, 1974.

Cohen, M. "Effective schools: What the research says." Today's Education, 70:2, 1980.

Darkenwald, G. G., Beder, H. W., & Adelman, A. K. Problems of dissemination and use of innovations in adult basic education: selected research findings and recommendations. Summary of Vol. II of planning for innovation in adult basic education. Research Report No. 5. New York, NY: Columbia Univeristy, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 430)

Devaney, K., & Thorn. Exploring teacher centers. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory, 1975.

Edmonds, R. "Some schools work and more can." Social Policy, March/April 1979.

Elmore, R. F. Organizational models of social program implementation. Public Policy, 1978, 26, 185-228.

Haber, R. N. The spread of an innovation: high school language laboratories. Journal of Experimental Education, 1963, 31, 359-369.

Hampson, D. Influencing the curriculum change process: a case study of a selected school district. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.

Kagan, S. L. When push comes to shove: enacting demonstration programs at the local level. Connecticut, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 208)

Kerins, C. T., House, E. R., Lapan, S. D., & Steele, J. M. Demonstration process factors leading to adoption of innovation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 047 417)

Little, J. W. School success and staff development: the role of staff development in urban desegregated schools. Boulder, CO: Center for Action Research, Inc., 1981.

Sadker, M., Thomas, D., & Sadker, D. Non-sexist teaching. Washington, DC: Mid-Atlantic Center for Sex-equity, 1981.

Treadway, P. G., Stromquist, N. P., Fetterman, D. M., Foat, C. M., & Tallmadge, G. K. Study of the career intern program. Final report—task A: implementation. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 841)